



**SPU Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)**

June 7, 2017 Meeting Notes  
 Seattle Municipal Tower, 700 Fifth Avenue  
 Room 4901  
 5:30 pm – 7:30 pm  
*Chair: Holly Griffith*  
*Vice-Chair: Quin Apuzzo*  
*Secretary: Emily Newcomer*

Committee Members	Present?	SPU Staff & Guests	Role
Quinn Apuzzo	Y	Susan Fife-Ferris	Division Director, SPU Solid Waste Planning and Program Management
Anna Dyer	Y	Sally Hulsman	Program Manager, Solid Waste Inspection & Compliance Division
Holly Griffith	Y	Socorro Medina	Senior Planning & Development Specialist, SPU Multifamily Recycling & Composting
Jamie Lee	Y	Dave Hare	Planning Strategic Advisor, SPU Solid Waste Planning and Program Management
Heather Levy	Y	Sego Jackson	Solid Waste LOB Liaison
Emily Newcomer	Y	Natasha Walker	CAC Program Coordinator
Chris Toman	N	Sheryl Shapiro	CAC Program Manager
Colin Groark	Y		
James Subocz	Y	<b>Guests</b>	
Alan Garvey	Y	Adam Maurer	
Amelia Fujikawa	Y	Jennifer Leigh	

**ACTION ITEMS:**

- Socorro to return once she has conducted further analysis of behaviors/motivations from Multi-family studies

**1. Regular Business**

SWAC Chair, Holly Griffith called the meeting to order at 5:35 PM

- Members and guests introduced themselves.
- SWAC Members approved the May meeting notes.
- Sheryl indicated emergency exits and bathrooms, and provided a brief safety overview. She reminded attendees to sign-in.

**2. Solid Waste LOB Updates**

SPU Solid Waste Planning and Program Management Division Director, Susan Fife-Ferris and Solid Waste LOB Liaison, Sego Jackson, provided a few Solid Waste Line of Business and legislative updates.

- **Emergency Operations Center (EOC) Homelessness Response Activation.** Almost done with 16-week activation that has been extended indefinitely. The City is exploring funding options for continued on-site cleanup in 2018.

- **Susan introduced Dave Hare.** Will be overseeing the Solid Waste Plan Amendment. Susan said to expect to see him a lot over the next couple of years while they are kicking off and finalizing the amendment.
- **Long-Haul Contract Savings:** Seven proposals were approved by Mayor's office. Three are included in the 2017 Supplemental Budget, and portions of all seven will be included in the 2018 Budget proposal. Susan said she is happy to provide SWAC more information about the proposals if they want more detail. All requests for funding will go through the Council approval process.
- **Collection RFP (Curbside).** The RFP is in the process of being drafted. Expected to be released next week for external stakeholders, who will have through the end of the month to comment.
- **Re-Use Center at the North Transfer Station.** Will provide details once they know more.
- **Legislation updates.** Segó did not have any key updates from the second session to share.
- **Bag Ban Update to Council.** Segó provided context on the update, noting that when Council revised the bag ordinance last August they included some reporting requirements. Staff has prepared a memorandum that includes those updates. Segó noted that the update is still in draft form and if there is interest in more details, this topic can be included in a future meeting.
- Susan reminded Committee members of the sensitivity of draft documents shared with SWAC members. She wanted to ensure that the final version goes through Council before it makes its way to the public, but still wants to be able to get input from SWAC.

### 3. **Multifamily Plan Overview;** Socorro Medina, Multifamily Recycling & Composting

Socorro began with an overview of the recycling rate goals, the nuances of the Recovery Rate calculation, and the challenges that this poses for meeting Multifamily goals. Key takeaways from her presentation include:

- The overall recycling goal is 70% by 2020. The Multifamily goal to meet the overall goal 54%, which implies an average annual increase of 2.6% over the next 6 years.
- SPU is working on an information and data-driven foundation for Multifamily outreach, while integrating equity. Socorro said she is still working on the summary of the barriers/motivators analysis and **can come back at a future date to present on this.**
- In Seattle, there are more than 5,000 Multifamily properties. We wanted to collect data and information about them and we used different methods:
  - o We visited 200 of the 300 buildings with 100 or more units and collected information on-site.
  - o We also conducted phone surveys with residents of building of all sizes.
  - o Today Socorro presented some of the solid waste infrastructure data obtained in multifamily properties.
  - o As a preface, she asked members to guess what percentage of single family homes have co-location of recycling, garbage, and organics collection containers. She also

- asked members to guess what the average distance is between the typical kitchen and the food waste collection area.
- Although we don't have data on single family infrastructure, just by observation, we have some sense of what this is. Members guessed that in single family homes 90-95% have co-location of recycling, garbage, and organics collection containers and that the average distance between the typical kitchen and the food waste collection area is between 15-40 steps in a single-family home.
  - This is a huge difference from what happens in the multifamily sector, where collocation of the three streams is not the norm and residents often have to walk down many floors from their kitchen to the food waste collection area.
  - Socorro presented some data, by building size, on collocation and location of organics container.
  - For the larger buildings, she also presented data of a subjective assessment on how robust is the use of the food waste service. Not surprisingly, in the group of buildings that have the most robust food waste service, there is a high percentage of buildings that have the three streams collocated and that have the common food waste container on each floor.
  - In conclusion: having collocated bins and providing convenient access to the food waste helps divert food from the landfill.
- **Committee member question:** (Clarification of slide "Use of FW rating service, co-location, and FW location") So no subsets of blue and green had different FW locations?
  - **Guest question:** (Clarification of slide "Use of FW rating service, co-location, and FW location") What is a "huge" percentage of buildings?
    - **Answer:** It's a subset of the total surveyed.
  - **Committee member question:** (Clarification of slide "Use of FW rating service, collocation, and FW location") What percentage was strong?
    - **Answer:** Strong = 17%.
    - **Committee member comment:** So, most were in the middle.
  - **Staff question:** Is there a correlation between the number of units and the age of the unit? Wondering about the design of the buildings.
    - **Answer:** That's a good question. I do not know.
  - **Staff question:** So, this is what they have? (referring to salesforce normalized capacity outreach dataset). Do you also track what you expect them to have?
    - **Answer:** We have standard recommendations for cy/unit (different for garbage, recycling, and organics).
  - **Guest question:** Is it possible to look at average cost (rent) per unit versus access.
    - **Answer:** That is a very good question
  - **Staff question:** In the 100 unit buildings, did you look at the number of stories per building? Did the locations with trash chutes result in lower food waste?
    - **Answer:** We have the data but I haven't mapped it yet. We looked at chutes, food waste rooms, etc.

- **Staff comment:** They even have food waste chutes now.
- **Committee member question:** Super excited about all your work; I think it's a wonderful starting point. When you're looking at success of programs (the rating 1-4), are you mostly looking at amount going into the cart or also the items?
  - **Answer:** We wanted to see if people were putting things in the cart, the right things in the cart, and if it was getting picked up. It wasn't about the amount (we didn't time it with pick-ups). It was more about the robustness of the participation.
  - **Committee member question:** The picture you used had a lot of contamination. So even though the bin is being used, the subjective rating would have been low?
    - **Answer:** Yes.
- **Committee member question:** How will the education (hired through the contractor) be made available? Will it be offered for free? Can people sign-up buildings?
  - **Answer:** It will be free. We will use our metrics to visit/prioritize buildings but we will also respond to buildings that contact us. We also have a tool online where Multi-Family residents will notify us if we don't have adequate FW/Recycling. Can report anonymously.
- **Committee member question:** I think it's super complicated what you're doing. I've done private hauling and the best relationships were with onsite managers who could enact right away. Some property managers are better than others and many change hands frequently. What's your best success when you're trying to get a building to do what you want them to do (change behavior)?
  - **Answer:** From what I've seen, the property manager is key. If they don't become thoroughly educated about Solid Waste and our Programs, it's hard to be successful. We expect a lot of the property manager, so the next phase of the work is figuring out how to support them better. And there's constant training because people move and property managers change. It's challenging but seeing buildings that work well makes me feel it is possible.
  - **Committee member question:** Do you see that some property managers do better than other ones?
    - **Answer:** Can't comment on that yet. If they are interested in solid waste and diversion, they have better outcomes but I can't tell you which property management company is best. It's more the onsite manager than the property management company. If the person is not onsite, it's difficult to keep an eye on them.

#### 4. **SWAC Commitment to Public Engagement;** Sheryl Shapiro, CAC Program

Sheryl opened the discussion on why Community Advisory Committee members should be involved in public engagement. She discussed the CAC Program interview process, which emphasized CAC member connections to communities. Given that everyone can't serve on the Committees, how do we broaden our reach and influence? How do we listen to other peoples' interests, barriers,

concerns and whether they know about SPU services and programs? Sheryl asked Committee members to begin considering events and/or meetings and/or activities they might attend. She encouraged them to start in a place with which they are familiar.

- Committee members were provided with CAC business cards and CAC Program flyer to share as they engage at events/meetings, as appropriate.
- The City of Seattle Public Engagement and calendars were shared as sources of information on potential activities to consider.
- <http://www.seattle.gov/event-calendar/other-city-calendars>
- Sheryl said that at the August meeting, the CACs will dive deeper into this topic, and in the future, have a discussion of how we can meet the Race and Social Justice Initiative's (RSJI) inclusive public engagement goals. Down the road, we'll look for gaps in CAC community connections and discuss how we can be more inclusive. Sheryl's commitment is to bring information and tools to you, and engage CACs more deeply in the RSJI. She said she is looking forward to partnering with CACs on that.

- **Committee member comment:** It's a great opportunity to observe people enthusiastically trying to participate in SPU programs (even if they're doing it wrong). Amazing to see people who are genuinely engaged on the topic of waste diversion, even if they're making mistakes.
- **Committee member comment:** I was at the community outreach meeting around the Strategic Business Plan, at Langston Hughes. If you have the opportunity to see a multi-lingual event like that, with 3-4 different languages in the same room, it's very informative. If not something you witness regularly, and it's informative to the work SPU does.

5. **Executive Session: SPU Annual Recycling Report: Results and Discussion of Letter;** Susan Fife-Ferris  
Susan provided an overview of the 2016 Annual Recycling Report draft, which is not public yet, and will go to Council in final form by 7/1. The purpose of this session was to present the information to SWAC so that they had what they needed to draft a letter that could be included in the final draft transmitted to Council.

**Timeline for SWAC Letter:**

- Emily will incorporate what was discussed tonight, then provide a chance for SWAC input, then send off a draft to Segó/Susan/Natasha/Sheryl before 6/12 AM in order to include with the draft transmitted to the Mayor's office. If it's in Word version, not signed, Susan will put a DRAFT on it and include it with the draft transmitted to the Mayor's office.
- 6/16: Susan needs a PDF with signed version without Draft on it to be submitted to Council.
- Susan acknowledged this was a tight timeline, and if SWAC couldn't meet it the letter could just be included in the package to City Council.

6. **Around the Table**

- **Committee member comment:** I could provide a tour of the QFC and Starbucks upstairs (they close at 6:30 but the meeting could be there). It's a big business with 100 employees, 4k transactions per day.
- Committee member shared that the WA Organics Workgroup report is done. Heather will send link to forward to the group.
- Segó will be gone for the next 3 weeks.
- No meeting in July.
- Quinn: Sent out a Doodle poll but had issues; expect an email to gather new dates for a field trip.

**Adjourned 7:30PM**